

# Virginia Argus.

RICHMOND:

FRIDAY, AUGUST 5, 1868.

It appears from various accounts from the North that Federal intrigue is exerting itself in every possible shape to diminish the popularity of Mr. Madison in the idle fancy that Mr. Pinckney may be elevated to the Presidential office. We have felt these federal pulsations in the south, but they are too languid to excite the least apprehension of mischief. But when we find that federalism has lost even the virtue of opposition from principle, and commingles itself with every species of malice, slander and British animosity, which tends to the injury of our country, it is necessary that they should be watched with an anxious eye, and exposed with an unsparing pen. We disdain that kind of intolerance which would impose the least restraint upon the freedom of opinion, or that would denounce an opponent as an enemy to his country merely because he professed dissimilar tenets, but where it becomes evident that his opinions do not come from his heart, that they are formed in political rancor and that he is resolved to oppose without even examination, it is time to give hypocrisy its true name, British adherents their proper title, and federalists, their true character. Some time past they were in a dull state of listless despair, their energies were exhausted, and their object of denunciation was too much revered and admired to promise the least hope from perseverance. They were quiet in despondence until the sound of treason inspired a hope that by its success Anglo-federalism might revive. They immediately surrounded the arrested traitor, and even complained that such a man should be confined. More civility, more courtesy, and a greater dispensation with the forms of criminal law were displayed upon this occasion than ever was known before, and yet the government was accused of more harshness and malignant persecution than ever disgraced the star-chamber of Britain or the inquisition of Spain. This furnished refreshing food for declamation, and after writhing and distorting every circumstance in the history of this business, and advocating treason under the name of oppression, they found it was fruitless, and they again became still and apathetic. The development of this affair however, convinced them that there were disaffected persons ready to join *coute qui coute*, in any plan for the destruction of the government, and the principal actors of the drama became so many deities of worship. The next occurrence that caused a quicker circulation in the federal body, was a juncto of enterprising men in congress, who suddenly threw off the cloak of dissimulation, and avowed themselves as the enemies of the administration. They expected that their characters would sanction their reports, and that their situation would insure their truth. The story of Jenkins's ears scarcely excited more noise in England, than that about foreign influence and back-stair intrigue did in America. The members of the minority who before were objects of federal proscription, were suddenly transformed into independent and enlightened patriots. Here we find federalism already united with traitors and anti-ministerialists, entering into a triple alliance to accuse the EMBARGO as a kind of political Pandora box which opens upon the country every evil, moral or divine, physical, commercial and agricultural, without leaving even hope at the bottom. This is the great confederation who support the election of Mr. Pinckney. This is their picture, fellow citizens, "look at this, and then on that" of the people.

## A QUESTION TO POLITICAL JURISTS.

Has the king of Spain according to the hereditary monarchy of that country, a right to transfer that by deed which it has been contended he could not do by last will? When the Austrian line failed in the person of Charles II, who left no issue, he bequeathed the throne to Philip Duke of Anjou, but when there is no failure can the throne be conveyed from the family?

We would recommend it to our Brother Republican Editors to suffer the notorious apostate Cheetham to sink into contemptuous oblivion. He has been indignantly expelled from the church, and nothing that he can do, can injure our doctrine or lessen our faith. Any more attention to him may be construed into regret for his apostacy.

## LAST ACCOUNTS FROM EUROPE.

It appears that the insurrection of the manufacturers in England becomes more general and alarming every day. The Manchester manufacturers in consequence of the refusal of Parliament to entertain a bill for fixing a minimum for their weekly labour, assembled in so riotous and tumultuous a style that it was necessary to employ military force. There were several killed and many wounded. The universal cry was "we have nothing to eat, and unless our wages are raised we might as well play and starve as work and be furnished." The writer observes that "I have just seen a poor old widow with five children whose husband was shot in the entry, and I find that many of the multitude have been taken to jail." We regret that we cannot present this interesting sketch of the distress of the English manufacturers in this day's Argus.

Humanity cannot forbear to drop a sympathetic tear at the miserable situation of these people, whilst indignation must rise in every bosom at the conduct of the British ministry. The old proverb of *evil be to him that evil thinks*, is about to be verified in regard to them. They have endeavored to excite insurrection among us, and have even speculated with joy upon the horrors of our civil commotion, but now instead of raising rebellions, they will have to learn how to quell them.

## FOR THE ARGUS.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir, The great diversity and often contrast of honest opinion has scarcely ever appeared to me in so striking a light as on the subject of internal manufacture. On this subject I offer you some remarks. If part of what I say relate peculiarly to Britain, it is because she is the most usual and most glaring example. If all my observations be not original, it is immaterial, so they are correct.

The poet Southey in his "letters from England" has given to the evils of the manufacturing system the highest coloring of which the subject is susceptible. The celebrated Godwin too, has portrayed them with the hand of a master. But European as well as American writers extend too far principles which correctly applied are correct themselves, and sometimes impute to this system evils which flow from other sources. The population of many countries is so great, that besides the number requisite for the cultivation of the soil, and that of those whose wealth exempt them from the necessity of manual labor, there is a surplus. That surplus will naturally emigrate into other regions where lands are more easily to be procured, or will turn their attention to manufactures. Circumstances of necessity or convenience may sooner occur to give a manufacturing bias to a nation, even where lands are easily obtained. Generally dearth of manufacture and dearth of population go together; but this connection, though at the first settlement of a country, it may have been founded on necessity, is afterwards continued by habit, and by habit alone. It is difficult for a single individual to employ his capital in one way to advantage, after having been long accustomed to another of a different kind; it is much more so for all the individuals of a great nation to do the same. Even should the obstacle to profit be ideal, it will have all the effect of reality—it will deter the capitalist from giving a new direction to his wealth, so long as he can employ it in the ancient channel. But when circumstances occur to prevent this, he must apply it in (to him) an unusual mode.

If the American merchant, when debarr'd from the particular trade in which he had been engaged has not yet become a manufacturer, it can be accounted for on other principles than those of individual unprofitableness or national inability. There have still remained open for him other branches of trade more nearly assimilated to that in which he had been engaged, and in which, consequently, his chance of success would be better. In these he has before him the examples of others, and can calculate the probable gain or loss. In manufactures but little can come to our knowledge without looking across the Atlantic, where a crowded population and governmental extortion; the fluctuations of trade and fashions; the high price of food and the low price of labor give to those employed in them, an excess of misery and a turpitude of morals, at which we shudder. It is thus the capitalist is induced to leave untried a branch of trade, in which, though new to him, he might make successful adventures. We expect the same effects will be produced by manufactures in this country. Without reverting to the immensity of causes which distinguish the European nations from us, we impute all their effects to the single source of the "manufacturing system," and judge from analogy that wherever this exists, the same events must succeed. It will not be difficult to point out some, the most obvious of those differences of situation, and to show the probability of their producing different consequences; but I must leave it to persons better skilled than myself in trade and politics, to point out the minor differences of causes, and the calculated variation of their effects. Perhaps for the sake of rendering it more perspicuous, I may place the same idea in different points of view, for I am persuaded that on a subject so interesting to the community even repetition cannot be disgusting.

In the vast chain of human events, and in the equally immense volume of human understanding, causes and effects are linked together; premises and conclusions are built upon each other. The effect of an antecedent cause will be the cause of a subsequent effect; the conclusions drawn from former premises, will themselves be premises for new conclusions; destroy one link in the chain or overthrow one proposition, and the whole must fall. Those who oppose the introduction of internal manufactures into the U. S. have adhered as one of their strongest arguments to the supposition that the high price of labor will render the attempt ineffectual. It appears to me that the low price of labor in proportion to that of food is the principal cause of the indigence and villainy complained of in manufacturing countries. And by what is this cheapness of labor produced? Sophistry itself can devise no answer but this; a crowded population. The soil has already its portion of cultivators whenever its proud lords will permit tillage to extend, and those who have not the fortune to be thus employed, must find out other methods to procure the necessities of life. The most natural are, emigration to some less populous region, and manufacture at home. The adventurer will seek some country where excess of numbers and barbarous policy shall not deprive him of the pursuits of tillage, or turn his attention to manufacture, and supply his wants by traffic. But governments do not always permit their subjects to enjoy the natural privilege of removing from the land in which they happen to be born. In this case manufacture is almost the only resource of those who cannot obtain agricultural employment. The number of agriculturists after a certain degree of population continues stationary, and the extra population is employed in manufacture. General population continues to increase, and the whole of this increase is employed in the same pursuit. As the number of those who offer their services, progresses, a competition is excited; the lowest bidders soon obtain employment; consequently the price of labor is lowered. In proportion to the increase of number is the demand for food; those who bid highest soon obtain it; hence its price is raised. The manufacturers, by the operation of these causes, are reduced to want; penury, the source of wickedness oppresses them; they endeavor by the most criminal means to obtain relief;—hence their corruption of principle—their total destitution of virtue. They have no lands to cultivate—they cannot seek a more propitious clime. When they cannot procure a sufficiency of food by the exchange of their commodities their choice lies in—the navy—or the army—or rebellion—or famine.

As the competition for the sale of labor and the purchase of food increases, those who supply the market with labor are induced to give a more assiduous attention and a more constant attendance; they devote themselves to unremitting toil, and the consequences are disease and death. Parents find themselves unable to support any part of their families in idleness, and as soon as their children can be taught to do any thing they are deprived of their infantile sports, and under the directions of task masters, must themselves earn a portion of that scanty pittance they receive;—hence their puny constitutions—hence their brutal ignorance of every thing but the particular art in which they are raised.

War too has a vast effect upon the manufacturers of Europe. With the increase of their enormous taxes, the proportionable difficulty of subsistence increases also. They are accustomed to receive food and raw materials from other countries for their wrought commodities. On a rupture with the nation which had been at once their store house, market & granary, they are thrown entirely out of business;—this produces want—want generates wickedness. Fashions sometimes change so suddenly, that the manufacturers have immense quantities of the very articles which were lately in the highest demand, lying dead on their hands; perhaps their workmen have been so long employed in the production of these, that they cannot succeed in any thing else:—effects of the same kind as are enumerated above, succeed, though they do not extend so far. Even in the best times enormous taxes oppress the laborers of Europe.

In the U. S. the price of labor is high and stationary. As long as this immense continent remains but thinly peopled, and its inhabitants are permitted to emigrate to any part of it or of the world, all the arguments I have heard against the introduction of manufactures are of no weight. The fertile soil which invites the agriculturist will always draw from manufactures so great a portion of labor, that the price of what remains must be kept up; for it is competition for employment alone which can sink the price of labor. In populous countries a hundred people are supported by every square mile; this is a very moderate computation; but supposing the continent of North America to contain nine millions of square miles with three inhabitants to each (which is perhaps an over proportion); and supposing further, that this population will regularly increase at the rate of a million a year; it will be eight hundred and seventy-three years before we shall be subjected to the evils of a too crowded population—it will be eight hundred and seventy-three years before the evils of the manufacturing system can be great. The necessity which exists in Europe, cannot during this period exist here. If the manufacturer finds the price of labor declining, he will apply himself to agriculture. For the same reason food will continue cheap. The two most efficient causes of European evils can have no existence here. There cannot in the revolution of ten centuries, if no incalculable causes intervene, be such a competition for the sale of labor and the purchase of food, as there now is in the Trans-Atlantic countries. If any unforeseen circumstance should induce it, it will be soon remedied; its existence cannot be permanent unless some universal mania pervades society, and hinders it from perceiving the poison and its antidote. Instead of the choice of the army, or navy, or insurance, or famine, we have added for our election agriculture in our own country, and emigration to any other.—The temptation to villainy cannot in this case be greater than is inseparable from man in society. Or if luxury generates corruption, and crimes keep pace with the progress of population, it ought not to be imputed to manufactures; no man will pretend there is not wickedness among us even when we are without them.

The difficulty of subsistence can never in this country be so great as to induce us to destroy our health by eternal toil, or to murder our children by the premature imposition of tasks. We do not "wish to supply Europe with wares," we are not "tenacious of the distinction of being the slaves of the rest of the world, and doing all their dirty work;" we only wish to manufacture for ourselves, and to be dependent for nothing on other nations. From the very nature of things, agriculture must long continue such a drain of labor, as to render it impossible for us to do this without the aid of labor-saving machinery; but by this, the inconveniences resulting from the high price of labor will be remedied. For this reason I would have manufactures become a governmental object. It will go beyond the fortunes of private persons to erect machinery of this kind, and they cannot afford to pay for the labor which will otherwise be requisite. If the nation should become the patron of manufactures, every good man will wish them success. The erection of machinery will be money saved to the community, without bearing hard on individuals. If the scheme should fail, the burden will be general, and little felt; not ruinous to particular persons. Should it succeed, the gain will be general too, for besides the advantage of being dependent on none but ourselves, it will bring money into the treasury. So far from preventing, it will give a stimulus to family manufacture; for any person may see how the labor is done, and have samples of the wrought commodities for their imitation. But if manufacturing societies can sell us what we want cheaper than we can furnish ourselves without them, let them do so; we will apply ourselves with cheerfulness to raise something to exchange with them. This is what the opposers of manu-

factures tell us to do with the nations of the old world; for to do it here, say they, would encourage monopolies. But these are not monopolies, unless that be a monopoly in which every man is permitted to engage, and then we are willing they should be so; the agricultural monopolists and the manufacturing monopolists will then render each other mutual support. But if it be a monopoly, I ask whether it is better to enrich our own countrymen by encouraging them in monopolies, or to give subsistence to British manufacturers by the same means? Is any man aware of the price we pay for manufacturing our own materials? Let us instance a bag of cotton: It is sold to one American merchant; who sells it to another at an increase of price; it passes through the hands, say of two British merchants at a similar advance by each; besides the profit made on the article by all those through whose hands it passes, it must pay its own postage, whether on land or water: it is next sold to a manufacturer who spins it into what he calls cotton yarn, and then sells it to another, advancing the price enough to pay his own profit and the wages of his workmen; the second manufacturer weaves and perhaps stamps it, and then sells it to another merchant with similar increase of price; on its return to us, the consumers, it passes through at least as many hands as in getting to Britain, and pays in the same manner its own postage, the profits of those who deal in the article, and the wages of supercargoes and clerks; its importation and exportation duties go partly into the treasury of Britain, and are entirely paid by the consumers. Can any person know this, and still imagine that foreign manufactures can come to us cheaper than our own? The situations of our waters permit us to enjoy every advantage of machinery, and consequently the degree of manual labor necessary will be comparatively small.

War cannot affect our manufacturers as it does those of the old world; nor can fashion. It will be as much as we can do to supply ourselves with what we want, and the demand will perhaps precede the supply; consequently nothing can lie dead upon their hands. The productions of Europe are more ornamental, but they will not long continue so—perhaps it were better they should; it would be a nearer approach to primitive simplicity, and the patriot would wear the productions of his own country, or wield a home-made sword with infinitely greater satisfaction than the gaudy dress or glittering weapon of another region. We are not to procure our own food from other nations; nor can our manufactures extend farther than our own consumption; then I cannot comprehend how any thing but a civil war, or an invasion, or a famine could influence us after the system had gotten into operation.

We are not burdened with a weight of taxes; this is a point in which we materially differ from the Trans-Atlantic states; this adds greatly to the difficulty of procuring subsistence there. In England, and I believe in most of the countries of Europe, almost every article of food is subjected to an excise, which raises the price to the consumer. The rich man cannot drink his wine and coffee, nor the poor his beer; the laborer cannot chew his crust, nor the newsmen vend his paper; nothing can be done but it increases the revenue—of whom? Not of the nation, so much as the king; not so much to defend the country, as to corrupt the representatives of the people who are but partially represented. Every man knows that this evil exists not in the U. S.

I have hitherto gone on the supposition that our intercourse with the other nations of the earth was still uninterrupted; but the pirates who scour the seas, and the edicts which threaten condemnation to our property, have obliged us to confine our vessels to our own ports, or employ them only in commerce with our sister states. The great capitalists are shut out from their accustomed trade, and only that of comparatively small adventurers remains. There are not left open branches of trade in which the gain or loss may be calculated from the experience of others. The trade which remains has already an over proportion of adventurers;—this is the time for the commencement of manufacture. If it be a measure of policy and utility while every navigable sea is open for us, and every region of the earth holds out the advantages of commerce, much more so is it when both are interdicted. Our capital is idle, and we wish to employ it; if we cannot do so in any other way, we will go to manufacturing rather than it should remain so.

It has been objected that when the restrictions on commerce are removed, our manufactures will fall of course. It is not likely this event will happen soon; the powers of Europe do not appear inclined to retract; until they do, we cannot, but by the double sacrifice of our peace and independence. And where in the mean time shall we be supplied with articles of necessity and comfort, if we do not furnish ourselves? Can we expect providence to shower down on us all the blessings of life, while we refuse to exert ourselves for their attainment? Can we expect heaven not only to give us manna at our doors, but to bring it into our tents, and place it in our mouths? But for the sake of argument we will allow that by the time our manufactures have gotten into full operation, the restrictions on commerce will be removed. In this case, the principal reasons which have hitherto prevented us from manufacturing, will no longer exist. The capitalist who has already engaged in it will have acquired some experience, and have given an example to others. His capital as well as theirs, will be drawn away from the old channel, and they may be induced by his success in the new to direct theirs into the same. Habit, which hitherto was the greatest obstacle, will then act in favor of manufactures. I think then, we may rationally calculate on their permanent continuance to at least as great an extent as they shall have gone when those clogs to trade shall be taken away. Nor need we fear their extension will be too great; this must inevitably be prevented by agriculture, that great drain to labor, even if we should have no foreign commerce to produce a similar effect.

We possess the raw materials for every thing essential to our comfort, except, perhaps, winter clothing; even with this article we can supply ourselves for a time, and perhaps permanently. Cotton is not so bad a substitute for wool as some imagine; many of the free white laborers in this country wear nothing else throughout the year. These are the men most exposed to the inclemencies of the weather; yet they continue robust and healthy. But we may have a mixture of cotton and wool, and it is said that cow's hair and tow make a good substitute for the latter. We may pay greater attention to raising sheep, and kill fewer of them, and in a few years we shall have as many as we want. In any event, winter clothing is the only article of comfort (not of luxury) with which we cannot supply ourselves. If we fail in this species of manufacture, the machinery and laborers employed in it will answer for cotton, with a little modification of the former and a little attention paid by the latter.

The country which despises the productions of every other and looks to itself alone for food and raiment, for convenience and luxury, cannot be affected by the political relations of any other, but in the single case of a direct attack upon herself. Such a country is a world to itself, and can be no more influenced by others, than one plant can by the rest. Relations of harmony and courtesy will be kept up, but neither enemies nor allies. It has been said, that the people of manufacturing countries are obliged to undergo an over proportion of labor; granted, where those countries are principally or entirely so, it is the summit of wise policy to induce a nation to labor only for itself, to feed only itself, and to trade only with itself; this is the way to be independent of other countries and to enjoy freedom among ourselves. Should all the nations of the earth pursue this policy, an everlasting and universal amity would ensue; one could have no pretext for attacking another, if they had no political connection. It appears to me that the present is the most auspicious period for the commencement of such an era in this country—an era at which the philanthropist's heart beats with rapture, though it exists but in imagination.

It appears to me that the present is the most auspicious period for the commencement of such an era in this country—an era at which the philanthropist's heart beats with rapture, though it exists but in imagination.

GRACCHUS.

1st August, 1868.

## FOR THE ARGUS.

To the Freeholders of the counties of Prince Edward, Charlotte, Buckingham and Cumberland.

## FELLOW-CITIZENS,

IT is with feelings of diffidence and reluctance, that I am induced to solicit your attention to a few observations. It is a duty which I consider of high importance, and one that I had fondly hoped would have been discharged by some person more conversant with composition, and better qualified by education. Truth, however, cannot be less acceptable or effective, because it is unadorned with the beauties of literature. Finding that no person has yet come forward as the friend of the people, and that those who are best qualified, are either engaged on the other side, or stand aloof, has induced me to disregard these little considerations in opposition to patriotic duty. The subject, fellow-citizens, to which I wish chiefly to direct your attention, is that of the next congressional election, for this district. The maxim which has always been impressed upon my mind, as to representation, is, that the candidate should correspond as nearly as possible, in interest, principle and opinion, with those of the people he represents. Let us examine the present representative according to this standard, to see how nearly he comes up to it, or how much he is wanting. In regard to his interest, it would seem, that as his property is much of the same species as ours, to wit, lands and slaves, that his interest should be much the same, if his conduct did not point out a different conclusion. Can it be possible that Mr. Randolph's interest is the same as ours, with respect to the measures pursued by the general government? To him, it appears, that no measure which the executive has adopted, for more than two years, has been right. To him, almost all the acts of the republican majority, appear to be unwise and impolitic. To us, they appear to be not only proper, but indispensably necessary. He charges the people of this district, with being under foreign influence, and ungrateful to him, who has served them faithfully for nearly 10 years. On whom then should we most rely? Whether on this stripling's will and caprice, or on those venerable patriots, who have served us 20, 30, and nearly 40 years, unimpeached, except by this gentleman and his adherents. I can but repeat, my fellow-citizens, on whom ought we most to rely? On our own judgments, supported by the opinions of these venerable sages and patriots, Jefferson, Madison, &c. by the majority in congress, by the majority of the people of the United States, and I may almost say, by the whole world—as it is the opinion of our most inveterate enemies as broad, that the measures of our government have been wise and politic. Even suppose that Mr. R. is right, and that we are wrong, which I can hardly admit—are we the feudal subjects of my Leige Lord John Randolph, and dare not murmur or complain at his conduct? Or is he our public servant, and responsible to us for all his public acts? Have we not a right, at stated periods, to call him to account? To turn one out and put another in, whose sentiments correspond with our own? Who would speak the voice of the people and be their representative, and not the trumpet of his own dogmas in direct contradiction to their principles and opinions. But you are told by this gentleman that you are under foreign influence, that his enemies have written letters to influential characters in the district, pointing out persons to be opposed to him. I wish to God that he may be found to be as clear of foreign influence as those he accuses.

But why has this gentleman, abounding in talents and knowledge, not condescended to furnish you with accurate statements of his conduct, and his reasons for it, that you might be correctly informed, and remain no longer under foreign influence? He is aware that his conduct will not bear the light of inspection, and therefore he conceals it in total darkness. He has, it is true, come forward with a public oration at this court-house, and has chaunted the same story at every round in the district; but what has he told you? That you are under foreign influence, that your government